

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the current Office Action and the reference(s) cited therein. No claims are herein amended; no claims are herein canceled; and no claims are herein added. As a result, Claims 1-5, 7-17, 19, 21-24, 47, 49-53, 55, 59, 64, and 66 are now pending in this application.

**Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-19, 21-24, 47, 49-53, 55, 59, 64,
and 66 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5, 7-17, 19, 21-24, 47, 49-53, 55, 59, 60, 64, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being “anticipated by [sic]” over U.S. Patent No. 6,023,507 issued to Wookey (“Wookey”). Although the Examiner has used the phrase “anticipated by,” Applicants will assume, for the purposes of this paper, that the Examiner intended to use the phrase “unpatentable over” because the Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). In any case, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In response to arguments that Applicants filed on November 21, 2007 (“Response to Non-Final”), the Examiner states the following:

Column 9, lines 7-9 state that “in one embodiment, the user name may be installed during a master monitor installation ...” This implies that embodiments were also envisioned in which a user name is not installed when the master monitor is installed. Furthermore, it implies that a user name is required for establishment of communications. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that, if the user name was not set at the time of installation, it would be set at the time of activation, i.e. when a request for monitoring is made.

However, the passage in Wookey cited by the Examiner (i.e., column 9, lines 7-9) expressly teaches away from the present invention by stating that “in one embodiment, the user name may be installed during a master monitor installation” The present claims, on the other hand, require the needed authentication information to be received, from a data storage system, in a request to establish a communications session - not installed during a master monitor installation. The monitoring software would not be able to receive a request, or anything else, until after it has been installed. Thus, Wookey teaches away from the present invention by teaching that, in some embodiments, the monitoring software has access to the authentication information at a

point in time (i.e., before or during installation) when the monitoring software is not yet even capable of receiving a request to establish a communications session.

Applicants further contend that the Examiner's assertion that at the time of the invention "it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that, if the user name was not set at the time of installation, it would be set at the time of activation, i.e. when a request for monitoring is made" is a *non sequitur*. In the sentence immediately preceding the passage cited by the Examiner, Wookey states that the communications program "may be initialized by logging onto the master machine as the user name designated in the monitor software." Column 9, lines 5-7. Thus, Wookey expressly teaches that at the time of activation (i.e., a user logging into the monitoring system) the user name (i.e., the authentication information) was already set as Wookey states that the user name used to log in is "designated in the monitor software." For the user name to be designated in the monitor software, the user name must have been set prior to activation (i.e., logging in) not at the time of activation as asserted by the Examiner. Wookey also expressly teaches away from the present invention by teaching that the master machine receives a request to establish a communication session from a user (i.e., the user logging in), not a data storage system as required by the present claims.

Further evidence, that Wookey does not contemplate, nor make obvious, the present invention is found in the fact that Wookey does not teach or suggest significant benefits that the present invention provides. At least some of these benefits are discussed in the Response to Non-Final. For example, by providing the needed authentication information in a request from the data storage system, the present invention allows the data storage system, instead of a monitoring system, to control the communications session to be established. The data storage system can provide enhanced security by providing authentication information at the time of the request, not *a priori* as in Wookey. The data storage system can also provide enhanced security by providing authentication information that is only used once for a particular communications session and will never be valid again.

Additionally, the present invention allows the data storage system to customize the communications session to be established. For example, the authentication

information provided in the request may enable a monitoring system to have access to only those components of the data storage system that the monitoring system needs to have access to in order to service the request. In this manner, a data storage system may insert specific authentication information into a request to customize the communications session to be established and allow a monitoring system only that access which is absolutely necessary to service the request. Not only does Wookey not teach or suggest this benefit, but again Wookey teaches away by indicating that a monitoring system may have the authentication information before the data storage system has even determined the request is needed (e.g., during installation of the monitoring system).

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would facilitate prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (508) 616-9660. If necessary, please apply any additional fees, or credit overpayments, to Deposit Account 50-3735.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 1, 2008

/Stanley Hill/

Stanley K. Hill
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 37,548
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive, Suite 280
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661